



**DRAFT
SUMMARIZED MINUTES
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
AND
AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 17, 2006
KIVA CONFERENCE ROOM – CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

CALL TO ORDER

The joint meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission and Airport Advisory Commission was called to order by Chair Gilliland at 6:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mark Gilliland, Chair
Brian Davis, Vice-chair
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner
J. David Hill, Commissioner
Kelly McCall, Commissioner
Andrea Michaels, Commissioner
Josh Weiss, Commissioner
William Howard, Commissioner

AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Donald Maxwell, Chair
Sean Asmus, Commissioner
Tom Guilfooy, Commissioner
Mike Osborne, Commissioner

ABSENT:

Fred Madanick, Vice-Chair
Leonard Tinnan, Commissioner
Lois Yates, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning & Transit Director
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner

John Lusardi, Long Range Planning Director
Dave Roderique, Economic Vitality General Manager
Jennifer Lewis, Aviation Planner
Scott Gray, Aviation Director
Harry Higgins, Senior Planner
Carrie Wilhelme, Associate Planner

1. **Transportation Master Plan and Related Studies**

Ms. O'Connor reviewed the program for the evening.

Mr. Roderique gave an overview of the vision for the economic future of the Airpark area. The original Airpark was developed in the late 1960s with the focus being on a true industrial park—primarily companies that wanted taxiway access.

That has changed dramatically over the last several decades. Today, what is defined as the greater Scottsdale Airpark is a much larger area. The focus has changed as well. There are very few new industrial park tenants; there is now large-scale office development, retail, and tourism-related activities. The few existing industrial-type businesses are being driven out because the area has become so expensive. The area is transitioning into an employment center rather than an industrial center.

A major trend in this area is a focus on re-development of the original Airpark core. Developers are tearing down old industrial warehouses and building multi-story office buildings. Therefore, there is greater intensity of employment than before.

Today, there are almost 2,300 businesses in the Airpark area, employing nearly 50,000 persons. There are a number of major projects in terms of the vacant land that is left, primarily the State land just north of the CAP which consists of about 700 acres along the freeway. The State Land Department has informed the City that they see this land as their “crown jewel.” The State anticipates significant, intense development. The other private piece that is still vacant is a project that DMB is working on in the area of the Loop 101 and Scottsdale Road. An application is soon to be submitted to the City for that project which will employ up to 7,000 employees upon completion. The State Land piece will employ up to 40,000 employees. It is anticipated that the current employment in the Airpark will double in the next 20 years to 100,000.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Guilfooy, Mr. Roderique responded that in the future, the focus at the airport itself would continue to be corporate jet aviation and some limited passenger service.

Commissioner Guilfooy inquired as to whether the Airport would be compatible with the Airpark in the long term. Mr. Roderique replied it would be compatible. There has been a move, in terms of some of the development to include a true, mixed-use component within the Airpark. However, there could be compatibility issues if residential units are developed.

Vice-chair Davis inquired as to how the employment density in the Airpark compares to other areas of the Valley. Mr. Roderique replied that he did not know the answer in terms of per square mile; however, the Airpark is believed to be the third largest employment concentration

in the Valley—downtown Phoenix and the Sky Harbor area are believed to be larger at about 60,000 employees.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Guilfooy, Mr. Roderique replied that the future composition of the workforce would be a higher demographic level than what exists today.

Mr. Lusardi stated that in the Mayor's State of the City speech in January, the Mayor listed the Airpark area as one of three top priorities. This is now an opportunity for advance planning to look at all the activities and bring them together in an updated form. The Airpark project area will be defined. The starting point will be the impact area, which is much of the State Land previously mentioned, and how those lands impact the Airpark. This will be a combined effort among many City entities.

The current work plan's focus is to identify impact area, project area, and stakeholders. The goal is to return to the Transportation Commission, the Airport Advisory Commission, and the Planning Commission in October.

This update is not going to be a new Airpark Master Plan, nor will it interfere with the economic vitality of the Airpark area or the operation of the Airport. This will be a strategic or implementation plan document.

Commissioner Taunton noted that large employment centers put a huge strain on transportation resources. One of the issues is that a large percentage of the workers at the Airpark do not live near it. One of the things that large employment centers do is bring more dense residential uses into the heart of that employment center to help ease the transportation infrastructure. That is where it gets tricky with the Airpark. In many ways, the Airport itself precludes dense residential in certain areas, and dense residential could preclude growth of the Airport. Commissioner Taunton inquired as to which comes first.

Mr. Lusardi stated that one of the things that will be analyzed is future land use in the Airpark. Residential development has certain pressures with respect to nonresidential development. Those kinds of combinations and their impact will be reviewed. It is legitimate to talk about residential in certain employment areas to reduce trips, but the cause and effect of putting a residential community next to a commercial community, and the associated issues, should be examined.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Taunton, Mr. Roderique responded that a study done in 1999 indicated that the labor market for the Airpark was predominately to the west into Glendale and south toward Chandler. He opined that this was still the case, although a lot of the new employment consists of better paying jobs. It is expected that commuting issues into the Airpark will continue.

Commissioner Howard noted that when considering transportation planning, it is important to know the amount of traffic flow within the Airpark, not just the flow in and out of it.

Commissioner Guilfooy inquired as to the last time Mr. Lusardi's department looked at the Strategic Plan for the Airport.

Mr. Lusardi replied he had only been with the City of Scottsdale for six months and referred the question to Mr. Higgins, who replied it was in 1995. Commissioner Guilfoxy asked Mr. Lusardi to clarify his work plan.

Mr. Lusardi stated it is a methodical review and update of the Plan, ordinances, and land use regulations.

Commissioner Guilfoxy voiced concern that the last Strategic Plan was done over ten years ago, and inquired if there was a short-term implementation plan. Mr. Lusardi replied that one of the Transportation Master Plan's key elements is the Airport. An economic analysis is also being done. The land use policies and zoning ordinance issues tend to direct development in the Airport. They will be examined to ascertain if change is needed.

Chair Maxwell stated that most of the businesses in the Airport are not interactive. With reference to the zoning, what is happening to the west side should be taken into consideration. It is all high-rise, which has a direct impact on the Airport. It is an entirely different area of town and it is being treated differently from the City of Phoenix. He stated that he witnessed the start of the Airport and does not see an end to the growth. It is a good enterprise zone in that it is self-sufficient. However, the Airport Advisory Commission has never had the chance to address the traffic problem.

Chair Maxwell stated he did not see anything wrong with the mixing of residential and commercial. For example, in Denver, when the close-in airport was closed and moved outside of town, the residential and commercial population moved to the airport. This is happening with Scottsdale as well.

Mr. Lusardi reiterated that the Airport area needed to be defined for the purposes of planning and policy. Secondly, the issues that Chair Maxwell spoke of need to be identified.

Commissioner Weiss echoed Commissioner Howard's comment regarding Airport traffic. He opined there is also a need to do research to identify what type of transportation is needed in order to be the most effective.

Mr. Roderique stated this area has become a significant area for retail businesses. A significant number of trips are from residents coming into the Airport to shop.

Chair Gilliland stated there seemed to be a concern for lack of projections, data, and specific recommendations on projects. He made an inquiry to the staff regarding overall compatibility of the schedules.

Ms. O'Connor indicated that although the last full effort associated with the Airport area's Strategic Plan and review of the economic factors was in 1995. There have since been updates. Ms. O'Connor did not want to leave the impression that staff were not paying attention or were not aware of the growth of the Airport. This is a time where there is a confluence of a lot of different areas working together, partially related to the Master Plan. It is a critical time in the Airport's and City's development to ensure all segments of the work plan match. Current data exists and is constantly being developed. Staff is working diligently to coordinate this effort.

Ms. O'Connor provided an example of Airpark circulation. There is an issue of whether to initiate a tunnel project. If not, other specific projects would have to be recommended to replace the tunnel project within Prop 400, which would require an amendment process. There are short- and long-range components of this effort.

Commissioner Guilfooy voiced concern over the process itself. For instance, Transportation will meet with the Planning Commission, but the Airport Advisory Commission will not. The process starts with Economic Vitality and the next step is Planning because there will be zoning issues. Leaving the Airport Advisory Commission out of the process is not correct, because there are certain issues that need to be coordinated in a systematic manner.

Ms. O'Connor reiterated Mr. Lusardi's statement that there was a need to coordinate the three Commissions and tonight is a starting point to identify issues and the need for future meetings.

Vice-Chair Davis stated that in terms of planning, he would like more firm information on what the build out will be for the Airpark as it relates to size and density. This will allow comparisons to be made to other areas in the Valley.

Commissioner McCall stated within the Community Mobility document, there are references to telecommunications centers. She asked if this had become outdated since the time the document was written.

Mr. Meinhart responded that several years ago in the development of the Capital Improvement Program for transportation, funding for telecommunications centers was deleted. With advances in technology, it does not make sense to create these centers any more when people can perform these functions from their homes.

Commissioner Michaels suggested that the Transportation, Planning, and Airport Advisory Commissions meet together to share information and identify issues.

Mr. Gray provided an overview of Part 150 Noise and Land Use Compatibility Study, which addresses residential, height, and zoning issues. This study was adopted by the City Council in 2005, was approved by the FAA, and is being implemented in conjunction with the Planning Department.

The study addressed noise level associated with aircraft operations in and out of the Airport and defined noise contours. The Airport Advisory Commission as well as numerous citizens were involved in that study during the process.

The study identified compatible land uses relative to the operation of the Airport. Finally, there was the height zoning issue, which is on the books. The study is the predecessor to the rest of these studies, which will help protect the Airport from incompatible uses. As mentioned earlier by Chair Maxwell, residential within the Airpark is not necessarily a bad thing, it just depends on where it is.

The study also identified disclosure methods to property and business owners, as well as residents and business operators of properties.

The specific study that is going to be started in the near future is the Airport Master Plan update. Scottsdale has had four master plans since the City purchased the Airport in the 1960s. The

most recent was in 1997 and was approved by the City Council and the FAA. This will be an update to that study.

The Master Plan Study is a micro study—it is just the Airport itself and does not address anything beyond the boundaries of the Airport. Its purpose is to create an Airport Layout Plan, which is a 20-year capital improvement development plan for Airport construction work, such as taxiways, hangars, and auto parking associated with on-airport facilities.

It will touch upon the Airpark in general terms, but does not deal with the Airpark development. There are about 600 acres that are aviation-related and that will be the focus of the Plan. It will include examining existing facilities and a demand capacity analysis. The type of development that will take place from this point forward might be redevelopment of existing facilities.

A revised forecast will be issued. Most likely there will not be a significant change in the updated 1997 Airport Master Plan.

Mr. Gray explained that there is a big push in the industry for a very light jet. It is the new, upcoming type of aircraft that some people believe will be the taxi of the sky. It will need to be determined whether that type of aircraft will be used in Scottsdale. Corporate aviation comprises the primary use of the Airport and probably always will. Charter has been at the Airport for many years, but there may be a desire for a different type of charter activity to take place.

Commissioner McCall voiced concern about private airplane operation being pushed out. She inquired as to whether there had been any resistance from those persons utilizing the Airport.

Mr. Gray responded that Airport utilization by a private pilot is not determined by the City; it is determined by the pilot. If a pilot chooses to come to Scottsdale Airport, he/she is accommodated. However, the economics have changed. For the private pilot who used to fly for pleasure, it has become very expensive because of the cost of jet fuel; therefore, they are choosing not to operate their aircraft as much. The goal is not to eliminate users, but to accommodate as many users as possible within the 320 acres.

Commissioner Michaels asked Mr. Gray how the economic benefit or a continuation of benefit to the Airport might be impacted by the development in Glendale and Deer Valley as the air traffic increases.

Mr. Gray responded that this topic had been discussed at the commission level and will be addressed in the Airport Master Plan. Scottsdale Airport is the corporate airport of choice in the state. It is anticipated that many of the other airports in the area will start building facilities that will accommodate the corporate business. This will have some economic impact on the Airport; however, many of the users will continue to use the Airport for various specific reasons.

Commission Guilfooy stated he had concern about the Airport Master Plan engineers doing the plan, because what drives it now is a marketing plan as the engineering is pretty much in place. He inquired as to how competent engineers would be in doing a marketing study.

Mr. Gray responded that the Airport Master Plan is conducted by an airport planning consultant, not the City's engineering firm. They focus on the forecasts, demand capacity, and generalized types of construction that may take place. Once that plan is completed, it is used to provide

guidance to the engineering firm on the types of facilities that need to be designed and funded. This will be driven by the 20-year market outlook for the Airport.

Commissioner Guilfooy stated that the Airport budget does not increase from year to year; fuel quantity and operations does not increase. He asked how the figure for the Airport's plan for traffic is determined.

Mr. Gray responded that the Airport Master Plan update will identify the types of use, the number of operations, and the number of passengers that may use the various types of aircraft. That information will be provided to the transportation planners who will use that information to determine traffic counts. This Study will begin by the end of this year, will take 9-12 months to complete, and will be sent to the City Council, FAA, and ADOT for approval.

Ms. Huish distributed copies of the presentation on the Master Plan, as well as the goals and criteria, and the criteria for the high-capacity transit system. She explained that ideas and alternatives are being tested against those criteria that were established several months ago. Drafts of the elements of this plan will be developed, starting with the specific-area studies; followed by the streets, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian plans. The public hearing process will be started in early 2007.

Ms. Huish gave a presentation on the Master Plan.

An evaluation of the "person/trip" access to the Airpark will be done.

Commissioner Guilfooy inquired about the differentiation between access to the Airpark and access to the Airport.

Ms. O'Connor replied this was the reason for the discussion—identifying the most critical factors to be included in the evaluation.

Commissioner Asmus stated that the tunnel idea did not seem to be viewed favorably. He inquired as to how much money was set aside in Prop 400 for the tunnel and how easy it will be to use those monies for an alternative solution, such as a road to the south of the Airport.

Ms. O'Connor replied that the Airpark tunnel was developed as a concept several years ago, which was previous to some of the issues, primarily security and cost, being faced today. When the concept was developed, no specific evaluation for alternatives for the tunnel was done—only alternatives to alignment of the tunnel. Seventy percent of \$81 million (adjusted for inflation) is what is available for the tunnel project in Prop 400. The proposition does not include the tunnel project in the first ten years. This issue should be addressed and finalized now, so that in ten years a decision will not need to be made as how best to utilize the monies. The tunnel is not being discounted entirely, but it is a lot of money for a very small segment of roadway. Alternatives should be examined so that taxpayers' dollars are utilized in a cost-effective manner and to ensure that the City can afford it.

Commissioner Guilfooy stated that in talking about cross-town traffic to the Airpark, what can be easily overlooked is that there is no internal circulation within the Airport. To maneuver the Airport, an exit must be used to go around.

Ms. O'Connor advised that this had been addressed in the technical evaluation criteria for internal access and circulation.

Chair Maxwell stated that the Airpark was on both sides of the runway. That is why the amount of intra-Airport traffic is so important in the evaluation.

Commissioner Osborne noted that regional transit had not been addressed tonight. There is a tremendous amount of traffic through that area that is going from extreme north Scottsdale into central Scottsdale or Phoenix. He inquired as to whether this issue should be added to items for evaluation.

Chair Gilliland replied that information on the high-capacity transit corridor along Scottsdale Road would be given in tonight's meeting.

Mr. Meinhart added that Prop 400 provides funding to add additional lanes to the 101 freeway system. Therefore, for traffic passing by the Airpark, there will be a lot going on in the next 10-15 years to help address that traffic. The role that the freeway has had on some of the routes to get to the Airpark from the south has been dramatic. The freeway system in itself will aid in the bypass traffic. There is also going to be a new express bus service on the freeway corridor. Within Prop 400, there is bus rapid transit on the Scottsdale Road corridor that is funded up to Shea and can be extended further north to tie into the freeway near Scottsdale Road.

Chair Gilliland added that in the past several years, there had been a substantial amount of progress on building the local roadway system further out. He and Mr. Meinhart gave further information on recently constructed roads that are alleviating traffic problems.

Commissioner Osborne stated there is another issue regarding regional transit in that area. That is that during the month of January, Hayden, Pima, and Scottsdale Roads are blocked.

Chair Gilliland stated that the most recent projects have dealt with ITS—the signal interfaces and ability to perform immediate traffic control and make adjustments for those high-volume events.

Ms. O'Connor added that the concept of special event access is relevant in the sub-area studies. If there is not already a criteria that relates to special events access, it will be incorporated; particularly since this area is somewhat affected by the confluence of the FBR and WestWorld activities which also impact the freeway corridor.

Commissioner Taunton opined that the major gap in the system for the Airpark that needs to be addressed is some sort of HOV direct-access connection from 101 to the Airpark area. It would not only serve the Airpark, but also the Airport. When an HOV facility is on a freeway and there is no direct access, a major weave situation is created and there is no additional benefit to transit. This employment center, although very large, is decentralized and it cannot be served in the same way that a central business district such as Phoenix or Tempe is served. A solution would be a single point of access that is convenient for all, and this can be done with an HOV connection. He provided an example of how this could be accomplished, based on a similar project he had worked on in Redmond, Washington, home to Microsoft Corporation.

Chair Gilliland questioned whether a transit or park-and-ride center would need to be established in addition to the ramp; or was Commissioner Taunton speaking of the ramp more specifically.

Commissioner Taunton indicated he was speaking about all of it. As an example, in downtown Phoenix during the peak hours, the HOV ramps are used by HOVs or by transit; but during off-peak hours, they are used by everyone. Therefore, if such a facility was built in the Airpark, it would provide an incentive during the peak hours to people who are traveling huge distances to get to and from the Airpark. During the off-peak hours, new access points to the Airpark would be provided and that facility could be augmented with a transit center or park-and-ride.

One of the unique things about this area is that not only is it an employment destination, but also many area residents could use that point of access to move around the region. Commissioner Taunton opined that there was a major disconnect in terms of the amount of investment that was going into the 101 corridor. It would be false to assume that some sort of transit service could be provided to effectively serve the bulk of the employment in the Airpark—it is not feasible given the density as it exists. If it becomes more dense, then it is possible. More creative ways need to be considered, such as large employers providing shuttle service.

Mr. Meinhart stated Prop 400 provides for a transit passenger facility somewhere within the Airpark. The Master Plan will identify the best place for it.

Commissioner Taunton opined the primary focus should be ramp connection and what facilities would serve that afterwards.

Chair Gilliland inquired as to whether there were opportunities for other types of street improvements in this area rather than the tunnel that were not considered or available in the past.

Mr. Meinhart responded that studies done on the tunnel have been focused just on the tunnel itself. The last study was done in the late 1990s and included an estimate of cost to ascertain if there was interest in forming an improvement district of all the property owners within the Airpark. Ten years ago it was too expensive and since the tunnel is just to benefit the Airpark and not the regional transportation, it may not be a viable approach.

Another problem area is Hayden Road—going north it bends to the east and intersects with Frank Lloyd Wright 900 feet from the centerline of the freeway, creating an intersection that is a challenge to the motorist. This area is being studied to ascertain if it can be improved. The Thunderbird corridor is also being studied and various intersection improvements are being made to the Frank Lloyd Wright corridor.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the inclusion of the tunnel concept in Prop 400 was a placeholder to ensure there was a way and funding to address circulation in this area.

Chair Gilliland inquired as to whether specifically evaluated alternatives and recommendations would be made to the Commissions in two months.

Mr. Meinhart could not guarantee the time frame to be two months, but specific recommendations will be presented to the Commissions in the very near future.

Commissioner Weiss asked Commissioner Taunton for clarification of his earlier suggestion for specific ramps and lanes. Commissioner Taunton explained that they would be identical to the three current HOV ramps in this region.

Commissioner Weiss opined that this seems like a better solution than doing the connector again.

Vice-chair Davis inquired as to whether specific problem areas and their solutions had been identified.

Mr. Meinhart responded that the team (staff and consultants) was calibrating projections for the area. Some software modeling will be done in association with HDR using the new software program entitled TransCAD. Some of the bottlenecks in that area are being worked on with capital improvement projects.

Ms. Huish gave a presentation on high-capacity transit. It is an element of the Transportation Master Plan and has been through a long planning process. She highlighted the 2000-2003 Study entitled "Scottsdale/Tempe North/South Transit Corridor Study." It examined nine different modes of technologies that could be used and six different corridor alternatives to coordinate with the Central Phoenix/East Valley light rail project through Tempe. In 2003 the City Council approved the Scottsdale Road corridor for high capacity transit, but did not select the type of transit. The Transportation Master Plan will determine which type or types of high capacity transit will be used on Scottsdale Road .

Ms. O'Connor explained that some of the terminology used in the presentation and the format for the analysis is a federal format so that federal funds can be used for the capital costs of the selected technology options. It is very similar to the FAA types of criteria and analyses.

Commissioner Guilfoxy inquired as to whether the construction costs would be covered by such things as granting, bonding, and additional sales taxes.

Ms. O'Connor responded that a financial plan will be developed for whatever technology is selected by the consultant. Prop 400 funds can also be re-allocated.

Commissioner Guilfoxy inquired as to the financial viability of building such an operation.

Ms. O'Connor responded that operating costs for these systems vary on a per capita basis because, although the operations and maintenance cost per mile is the same for the different technologies, they have different capacities. Therefore, the cost becomes less, based on what the total vehicle capacity is. It is roughly \$1 million per mile in operating costs as well as variation in per-mile capital cost. The consultant will be providing a summary regarding the pros and cons of this issue.

It is not anticipated that new revenue will be requested in the initial stages. There might be regional revenue sources that are available in the long term. Prop 400 provides for 30 percent transit. Ms. O'Connor provided other examples of funding that might become available after the project has been started or is in operation.

Commissioner Guilfoxy inquired as to whether there were other cities that had undertaken a similar project.

Ms. O'Connor responded that the example that is the most parallel to Scottsdale is the Goldline in Pasadena. She provided examples of systems using these different technologies in several western cities (San Diego, Houston, Denver, Salt Lake City).

Commissioner McCall stated that Ms. O'Connor did not answer Commissioner Guilfooy's previous question on who would be utilizing the transit system.

Ms. O'Connor indicated this had been brought up at the Transportation Commission's last meeting. One of the unique factors of this corridor is that it is an all-day corridor with different origins and destinations. It has more than one university facility; it has a downtown with significant residential infill; it has major employment destinations; it has extensive retail and entertainment character; extensive underway or planned residential infill; and schools. She did not currently have an estimate of the potential ridership, but it will be part of what the consultant effort will incorporate.

At Commissioner McCall's request, Ms. Huish reviewed the legend on the slide of the aerial map of the bus station at Oak Street.

Commissioner Howard opined that the analysis presented was presented in isolation—it only has to do with Scottsdale and only gives options for Scottsdale. Yet once it is completed, it becomes part of the system and Scottsdale becomes part of the group of communities that bear the burden of the entire system, as opposed to just the part that is in Scottsdale. He inquired as to the cost of the membership in this system.

Ms. O'Connor responded that she did not have the answer. However, no one has asked Scottsdale to participate in the light rail system. This question came up at the last Commission meeting, and some factors were identified as possible costs of participation and will be analyzed as part of the technology selection discussion. Some of those costs include possible use of trackway and maintenance facilities. She reminded the group that the consultant will be examining costs that will be partially borne by Prop 400.

Commissioner Weiss provided an example of how the City would or would not have to pay fees, based on whether or not it used the system or just provided connections.

There was no discussion on potential action.

2. Public Comment

Mr. Michael Fernandez, 4338 North Scottsdale Road, owner of Pottery Paradise, distributed a packet of information to the Transportation Commission. He advised that if any member of the Airport Advisory Commission wanted a copy, he would get it to them. He gave a brief history of his background.

He indicated that the packets contained facts and figures from government agency reports and articles written and researched by experts on light rail transit. He opined that a light rail transit system would have a negative impact on Scottsdale and its citizens.

Light rail has the highest rate of non-occupant fatalities over any other form of transportation. Also, when compared to any other form of transportation, it has the highest rate of murder, rape, robbery, assault, larceny, theft, burglary, and arson. It is by far the least cost-effective way of moving people. He stated there are more facts in the packet for the Commissioners to evaluate on the safety, security, and negative economic impact of light rail. He stated that neither he nor

his family will ever ride or congregate around a light rail train or station because of the knowledge that he has of light rail systems.

He attended the City-sponsored transportation working group meetings and realized that not one of the 20 members of that group owns property or a business on Scottsdale Road. He brought that fact to the attention of Ms. O'Connor and the Mayor. As a result, Tom Silverman, a business owner and former City Councilmember, was brought into the group. This is only one business owner representing all the businesses on Scottsdale Road. He opined that the study will be one-sided against the business and property owners on Scottsdale Road. There should have been a minimum of ten business owners in that working group. He and other business owners on Scottsdale Road would like to meet with the Transportation Commission in the near future to discuss the packet and the impact light rail will have on the City, its citizens, and the business and property owners of Scottsdale.

Chair Gilliland thanked Mr. Fernandez and advised that his comments will be taken into consideration in the evaluation process, which is just beginning. He invited him to return with fellow colleagues to express their views.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics, Inc.

NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on _____